

6.0 DRAFT SECTION 4(f) EVALUATIONS FOR THE WOODBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT, I-94/M-10 INTERCHANGE, AND THE UNITED SOUND SYSTEMS RECORDING STUDIOS

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 states that the Secretary of Transportation will not approve any program or project which requires the use of any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or any land from a historic site of national, state or local significance unless:

- 1) There is no prudent and feasible alternative to the use of such land, and
- 2) Such program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to these resources resulting from such use.

Section 4(f) evaluations are applied to projects that meet the following criteria:

- The project will be implemented with federal funds.
- The project will require the use of a historic structure that is on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) but is not a National Historic Landmark. (The term “use” means that the proposed project would have an adverse effect on the structure.)
- The Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) determines that evaluation of the project meets requirements set forth in FHWA regulations (23 CFR 771.135) for alternatives, findings, and mitigation.
- Agreement among FHWA, Michigan’s State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has been reached through procedures pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

6.1 Proposed Action and Need for the Project

A detailed description of the proposed project and its purpose and need are found in Chapter 2. A summary follows.

The I-94 project area is within the city of Detroit. The project is 6.7 miles long and extends from east of the I-94/I-96 interchange to the Conner Avenue interchange. I-94 is central to the metropolitan roadway network. Within a distance of approximately 1.2 miles, I-94 is crossed by I-96, M-10, and I-75. The M-10 and I-75 interchanges are included as part of this study. Project limits and intermodal freight facility are shown in Figure 2-1.

The purpose of this project is to provide transportation improvements to I-94 in the project area. These improvements would preserve and enhance Michigan’s transportation infrastructure and would improve capacity, safety, pavement, and bridges within the project area. The rehabilitation would also enhance traffic circulation by separating local traffic from freeway traffic.

The section of I-94 within the project area was constructed in the 1950s and is one of the oldest urban freeways in the country. It is aging and requires frequent maintenance. The design of various segments and interchanges is outdated.

High traffic volumes, substandard design, and inadequate capacity, especially during the morning and evening rush hours, contribute to congestion and an above-average crash rate. Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) in the I-94 project area ranges from 120,000 to over 160,000 vehicles and is expected to grow by more than 25 percent by the year 2020. In addition, heavy-truck volume is expected to grow three times faster than the volume of passenger vehicles. The capability of I-94 to handle trucks is especially important because I-94 is a vital link between United States and Canadian border crossings.

The Build Alternative, described in detail in Chapter 4, includes four depressed mainline lanes in each direction, a reserved median space, and acceleration and deceleration lanes at various locations. The I-94/M-10 and I-94/I-75 interchanges would be reconstructed as part of the proposed project. The project includes ground level, one-way continuous service drives on each side of I-94. The service drives would be three lanes wide and include sidewalks. The proposed typical section is shown in Figure 2-7.

6.2 Section 4(f) Properties

The Build Alternative would have an adverse effect on one district, the Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District, listed on the NRHP and two properties that are eligible for listing on the NRHP, the I-94/M-10 interchange and the United Sound Systems Recording Studios. The properties are discussed in detail in the cultural resources section of Chapter 5. Descriptions and impacts are summarized below.

6.2.1 The Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District

6.2.1.1 Description of the Property

The boundaries of the Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District are Trumbull Avenue, Grand River Avenue, Rosa Parks Avenue, W. Warren Avenue, Wabash, the Grand Trunk Railroad tracks, and the I-94 eastbound service drive (Figure 5-13). The district is south of I-94 and west of the Wayne State University (WSU) athletic fields and the I-94/M10 interchange. The district, which has an area of 162 acres, was listed on the NRHP in 1979.

Woodbridge neighborhood is a middle-class, turn-of-the-century, urban residential area of primarily one- and two-family houses. The best-preserved houses are on Trumbull, Wabash, and Twelfth streets. This area is the core of the historic district. The neighborhood is laid out in almost square blocks bisected by north-south service alleys. Houses and apartments in the district were built between 1885 and 1920. The houses range in form from Queen Anne-style houses to modest cottages. In a later building cycle, Stick-style and Second Empire-style houses with somewhat rambling floor plans were built within the district. A majority of the houses are brick, two and one-half story, one- and two-family houses with bay windows, broad front porches, and modest Queen Anne and Colonial Revival architectural features.

Small apartment buildings were also built within the historic district. A few emulated the architectural styles of the time including Art Deco influences and Georgian Revival architecture.

6.2.1.2 Impacts

The proposed I-94 service drive would be widened and encroach into the district approximately 6 feet. During a field review with MDOT, the SHPO indicated that the integrity of the historic district near the existing service drive was poor.

One house in the district would be acquired. It is located at 5287 Hecla Street. The store on the corner of Trumbull and the I-94 service drive would be acquired (Figure 5-14 and Appendix D, Sheet 2). At that location Trumbull would be raised to construct a bridge across I-94 with adequate clearance for trucks. The store's customer access would be impaired.

Also acquired would be two vacant lots and a fenced automobile storage lot. The lawn areas of two houses would also be acquired for widening.

Removal of the two buildings would have an adverse effect on the district. These buildings are on the periphery of the district. Even though the majority of the district and its buildings would remain intact after the acquisition and removal of the buildings, the acquisition of property and structures in the district would be an adverse effect.

6.2.1.3 Avoidance Alternatives

The No-Build and the Enhanced No-Build alternatives would not involve widening the service drive and would avoid adverse effects to the district. These alternatives, however, do not meet the purpose and need for the project.

If the mainline of I-94 were widened without constructing wider continuous service drives with three lanes, the opportunity to enhance transit, separate local from through traffic, and improve access would not occur. An alternative to narrow the service drive from three lanes to two lanes adjacent to the Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District would cause a bottleneck on the service drive. Narrowing the service drive by eliminating the outside lane would be a safety issue. Drivers would not expect the third outside lane to end.

Acquisition of the store on Trumbull Avenue cannot be avoided if a new bridge with higher clearance and pedestrian walkway is to be constructed across I-94. Without a bridge, vehicular and pedestrian access from Research Park Apartments to Woodbridge neighborhood and WSU would be impeded.

An alternative to circumvent the district would require realignment of I-94 and the M-10 interchange. Excessive impacts would result from right-of-way acquisition and displacements. A shift of the alignment of the roadway away from the district would

require the acquisition the Research Park Apartments north of the freeway and displacement of several hundred residents.

6.2.1.4 Measures to Minimize Harm

The house and store could be moved to vacant lots located within the district. Prior to construction, relocation of the house and store would be evaluated in conjunction with building owners, MDOT, and the SHPO. If the buildings are not moved and instead are demolished, they would be recorded to Historic Architectural Building Survey (HABS) standards. The documentation would be submitted to the SHPO, the National Park Service, which is the repository of HABS documentation, and other local archives.

6.2.1.5 Coordination

As a part of the planning process, the Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District was reviewed in the field with the SHPO on May 11, 1999. A letter dated August 2, 1999, describing the impacts of this project was sent to the SHPO for review and comment.

MDOT anticipates a Memorandum of Agreement among MDOT, FHWA, the SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) outlining the mitigation measures that have been proposed. An example of an MOA is in Appendix A. The MOA would stipulate that the MDOT participated in the consultation between FHWA and SHPO and was invited to concur that the undertaking would be implemented with measures to minimize harm. The MOA would then be submitted to the ACHP for concurrence.

On June 8, 1999, at a regular monthly meeting of the Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District, an overview of the I-94 Rehabilitation Project, the proposed improvements, and potential effects were presented to district officials and residents. A public hearing will be held to gather public input after circulation of this DEIS.

6.2.2 I-94/M-10 Interchange

6.2.2.1 Description of the Property

The I-94/M10 interchange was constructed in the early 1950s and connects two major freeways in Detroit (Figure 5-12). Ramps between the freeways allow traffic on one freeway to enter or exit the other freeway. The approximate area of the interchange is 39.4 acres. It is owned and operated by MDOT. A detailed discussion of the interchange is found in Section 5.10, of Chapter 5.

The SHPO concurred with findings in the 1995 *MDOT Michigan Historic Bridge Inventory* that the interchange is eligible for listing on the NRHP. According to the inventory, the I-94/M-10 interchange meets NRHP Criteria A for its association with

post-World War II freeway construction and Criteria C for its unique design. Eight of the 14 bridges that make up the interchange, as well as a pedestrian bridge, are historic:

I-94/M-10 Bridges

- M-10 southbound over the M-10 northbound ramp to I-94 westbound
- I-94 eastbound over the M-10 ramp northbound to westbound I-94
- M-10 southbound over I-94
- I-94 eastbound ramp to M-10 over M-10 southbound and I-94 westbound
- I-94 westbound ramp to M-10 over M-10 northbound and I-94 eastbound
- M-10 northbound over I-94
- I-94 westbound over I-94 ramp from M-10
- M-10 northbound over I-94 ramp from M-10
- Holden Avenue pedestrian bridge over M-10

6.2.2.2 Need to Replace the Interchange

The interchange at I-94 and M-10 is at the end of its useful life. The design life of a highway facility is usually 20 years, and the interchange was constructed over 45 years ago. The interchange and pedestrian bridges are deteriorating, and the ratings of the physical condition of the bridges that make up the interchange are substandard. The interchange does not adequately handle the volumes of traffic that currently exist and that are expected to increase in the future. Its design contributes to an above-average crash rate, and left-hand entrances and exits to and from the interchange present operational issues. The heights of the interchange bridges do not meet current standards that allow trucks to safely pass under the bridges.

6.2.2.3 Impacts to the Interchange

All of the bridges that join together to make up the interchange and the Holden pedestrian overpass would be removed and replaced with a completely new interchange for the Build Alternative.

6.2.2.4 Avoidance Alternatives

During the I-94 Rehabilitation Project study, alternatives to avoid the I-94/M-10 interchange were developed and evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the alternatives are provided in Chapter 4.

The No-Build Alternative would avoid removal of the I-94/M-10 interchange, if the bridges were rehabilitated instead of removed. The No-Build Alternative would include regular maintenance of the interchange and bridges. Under this alternative, no changes to existing I-94 and its interchanges would be made except those improvements required for a facility of this age.

An alternative to improve I-94 without improving the M-10 interchange was considered early in the development of the project (Chapter 4). Safety of the I-94/M-10 interchange would not be improved and the level of service (LOS) of the interchange would be

LOS E. Because the LOS of I-94 after improvements to the roadway would be LOS D, a bottleneck on the interstate would result. Safety and traffic operations of the interchange would not be improved and deterioration would continue.

An alternative to avoid the M-10 interchange by realigning either I-75 or I-94 and circumventing the existing interchange would require a new alignment through urban development. A realignment alternative would require extensive amounts of right-of-way acquisition and displacements. Impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods would be excessive and, as with the other avoidance alternatives discussed above, eventually the interchange would be removed for structural safety reasons.

6.2.2.5 Measures to Minimize Harm

To minimize harm and adverse effects on the I-94/M-10 interchange, the interchange would be recorded to Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards prior to reconstruction. The documentation would be submitted to the National Park Service, which archives HAER documents. Copies of the documentation would also be submitted to the SHPO and appropriate local archives.

6.2.2.6 Coordination

A letter dated August 2, 1999, detailing the impacts of this project, was sent to the SHPO for review and comment. The SHPO agreed with the 1995 *MDOT Michigan Historic Bridge Inventory* and the designation of the interchange as eligible for the NRHP.

A MOA among MDOT, FHWA, the SHPO, and the ACHP would outline mitigation measures that have been proposed Appendix L. The MOA would stipulate that the MDOT participated in the consultation between FHWA and SHPO and was invited to concur that the undertaking would be implemented with measures to minimize harm. The MOA would then be submitted to the ACHP for concurrence.

6.2.3 United Sound Systems Recording Studios

6.2.3.1 Description of the Property

The building housing the United Sound Systems Recording Studios is eligible for the NRHP and is located northeast of the I-94/M-10 interchange in the northeast corner of the intersection of Second Street and the I-94 westbound service drive. It is a two-story brick building originally built as a residence and has a two-story addition on the rear (Figure 5-15). Conversion from a residence to a recording studio has compromised its architectural integrity. United Sound Systems Recording Studios was founded in 1933 and was Detroit's first major recording studio. Its significance is in its African American contributions to American music, and it was important in the evolution of Berry Gordy and Motown. A complete description of United Sound Systems Recording Studios is found in Section 5.10.

6.2.3.2 Impacts

The proposed project would require acquisition of the United Sound Systems Recording Studios building. The mainline of the freeway is shifted to the north to construct the interchange, mainline, and continuous service drives of I-94. The building would be acquired for construction of the service drive and would either be relocated or demolished. An adverse effect would result.

6.2.3.3 Avoidance Alternatives

The No-Build and the Enhanced No-Build alternatives would avoid adverse effects to the building but would not meet the purpose and need for the study.

An alternative to avoid the building would require realignment of I-94 and the M-10 interchange. Excessive impacts would result from right-of-way acquisition and displacements. A shift of the alignment of the roadway away from the building would require the acquisition of WSU property that includes a large, multi-story parking garage south of I-94.

6.2.3.4 Measures to Minimize Harm

Different options are available to mitigate the United Sound Systems Recording Studios building. Preparation of a video documentary of the building and its history would be one option. Another option would be to evaluate during design the feasibility of moving the building to another location away from I-94. The building would be documented to HABS standards if moving it would not be possible. HABS documentation would be submitted to the SHPO, the National Park Service, and appropriate local archives.

6.2.3.5 Coordination

The SHPO reviewed the project and its effects on United Sound Systems Recording Studios. A MOA among MDOT, FHWA, the SHPO, and the ACHP would outline mitigation measures that have been proposed. The MOA would stipulate that the MDOT participated in the consultation between FHWA and SHPO and was invited to concur that the undertaking would be implemented with measures to minimize harm. The MOA would then be submitted to the ACHP for concurrence.

MDOT Real Estate would consult the owner of the building prior to a decision regarding disposition of the building.